REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11-16, 18-20 and 22-28 are currently pending, of which claims 1, 8 and 12 are independent claims. Claims 6, 10, 17 and 21 are cancelled in this Amendment. Claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 12, 18-20, 22 and 28 are currently amended. All of the claims were rejected. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The cited combinations are distinguished because power is converted at the power module (receiver) rather than the network supply. The Office rejected claims 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ishida in view of McCormack. Ishida teaches a storage management device. McCormack teaches signaling for power over Ethernet. Specifically, as shown in Fig. 2, McCormack teaches use of a variable power source (50) in a hub/switch. The end device (12") provides an indication of a power requirement, to which the power source is responsive. Col. 9, lines 4-15. Even if combined as suggested by the Office, this would yield no more than a storage device that provides an indication to the network of the power required, and a network that sets the power level in response. In contrast, the currently claimed invention converts the power to the appropriate level at the end device. Hence, the present invention may be implemented such that it is neither necessary to indicate the required power level to the network, nor adjust the power level at the network supply.

The distinguishing features discussed above are recited in both claims 1 and 8. Hence, claim 1 distinguishes the cited combination by reciting "wherein the power module includes a power converter for converting the power received from the power integrated network from a first voltage level to a second voltage level." Similarly, claim 8 distinguishes the cited combination by reciting "receiving data and power at the data storage device from the power integrated network; converting the power received from the power integrated network from a

first voltage level to a second voltage level; and using the converted power to energize the data storage device." Claims 2-5, 7, 9 and 11 are dependent claims which recite further distinguishing features, and are also allowable for the same reasons stated above. The Office is therefore requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 1-5, 7-9 and 11.

Claims 12, 14-19, and 21-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito in view of McCormack. Saito teaches a communication control device for providing services between networks utilizing different protocols. (Abstract) The Office does not rely on Saito as teaching power integrated networks or power modules, but rather relies again on McCormack. However, the claim set based on independent claim 12 distinguishes McCormack, both alone and in combination with Saito, for the same reasons already stated above. In particular, claim 12 distinguishes the combination by reciting "a power module coupled to the memory area and the control module, the power module receiving power from the first power integrated network, wherein the power module includes a power converter for converting the power received from the first power integrated network from a first voltage level to a second voltage level." Claims 16, 18, 19 and 22-28 are dependent claims which recite further distinguishing features, and are also allowable for the same reasons stated above. The Office is therefore requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 12, 16, 18, 19 and 22-28.

Claims 13, 20 and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Saito in view of McCormack and Ishida. However, each of these references, alone and in combination, are distinguished for the same reasons already stated above. In particular, the cited combination of references is distinguished because power conversion is implemented at the receiver rather than the supply. Claims 13, 20 and 26 are dependent, either directly or indirectly, upon claim 12 which distinguishes the cited combination by reciting the language already quoted above. The

Office is therefore requested to withdraw the rejections of claims 13, 20 and 26.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney at 978-264-6664 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

10 August 2004
Date

Holmes Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
Steubing McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park Drive
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-167
Dd: 8/13/2004